

# Analysis of a stabilized finite element approximation of the Oseen equations using orthogonal subscales

Ramon Codina

*Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Jordi Girona 1-3, Edifici C1, 08034 Barcelona, Spain*

Available online 18 January 2007

## Abstract

In this paper we present a stabilized finite element formulation to solve the Oseen equations as a model problem involving both convection effects and the incompressibility restriction. The need for stabilization techniques to solve this problem arises because of the restriction in the possible choices for the velocity and pressure spaces dictated by the inf–sup condition, as well as the instabilities encountered when convection is dominant. Both can be overcome by resorting from the standard Galerkin method to a stabilized formulation. The one presented here is based on the subgrid scale concept, in which unresolvable scales of the continuous solution are approximately accounted for. In particular, the approach developed herein is based on the assumption that unresolved subscales are orthogonal to the finite element space. It is shown that this formulation is stable and optimally convergent for an adequate choice of the algorithmic parameters on which the method depends.

© 2007 IMACS. Published by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

**Keywords:** Convection-dominated flows; inf–sup condition; Stabilized finite element methods; Orthogonal subscales

## 1. Introduction

This paper deals with a finite element formulation to solve second-order boundary value problems with two main features: the presence of (dominant) first-order terms with the physical meaning of *convection* and the inclusion of constraints in the solution space, in our case *incompressibility*. The simplest linear model that contains *both* ingredients is the Oseen problem, which consists of finding a pair  $[\mathbf{u}, p]$  as solution of the equations

$$-\nu \Delta \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla p = \mathbf{f} \quad \text{in } \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d, \quad d = 2, 3, \quad (1)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}$  is the velocity field,  $p$  is the pressure,  $\nu$  is the viscosity,  $\mathbf{a}$  is the advection velocity,  $\mathbf{f}$  is the vector of body forces,  $\Omega$  is the computational domain, assumed to be bounded and polyhedral, and  $d$  is the number of space dimensions. For the sake of simplicity, we have considered the simplest Dirichlet condition (3). Likewise, several simplifying assumptions will be made for the advection velocity  $\mathbf{a}$ . In particular, we will take it in  $C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ , weakly

*E-mail address:* [ramon.codina@upc.edu](mailto:ramon.codina@upc.edu).

*URL:* <http://www.rmee.upc.es/homes/codina>.

*divergence free* and with derivatives of order up to  $k + 1$  locally bounded by the maximum of  $|\mathbf{a}|$  (see assumption H2 in Section 3.1).

The Oseen problem stated above can be thought of as a linearization of the stationary incompressible Navier–Stokes equations. It also appears as one of the steps of some multilevel methods for these equations, or may result from a time discretization of the transient Navier–Stokes problem if the advection velocity is treated explicitly. This is why it is often used as a first step towards the analysis of the full nonlinear problem, both to obtain *a priori* and *a posteriori* estimates.

Let us introduce some standard notation. The space of square integrable functions in a domain  $\omega$  is denoted by  $L^2(\omega)$ , and the space of functions whose distributional derivatives of order up to  $m \geq 0$  (integer) belong to  $L^2(\omega)$  by  $H^m(\omega)$ . The space  $H_0^1(\omega)$  consists of functions in  $H^1(\omega)$  vanishing on  $\partial\omega$ . The topological dual of  $H_0^1(\Omega)$  is denoted by  $H^{-1}(\Omega)$ , and the duality pairing by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ . A bold character is used to denote the vector counterpart of all these spaces. The  $L^2$  inner product in  $\omega$  (for scalars, vectors or tensors) is denoted by  $(\cdot, \cdot)_\omega$ , and the norm in a Banach space  $X$  by  $\|\cdot\|_X$ . This notation is simplified in some cases as follows:  $(\cdot, \cdot)_\Omega \equiv (\cdot, \cdot)$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \equiv \|\cdot\|$ , for  $m$  integer (positive or negative)  $\|\cdot\|_{H^m(\Omega)} \equiv \|\cdot\|_m$ , and if  $K$  is the domain of an element (see below)  $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(K)} \equiv \|\cdot\|_K$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_{H^m(K)} \equiv \|\cdot\|_{m,K}$ .

Using this notation, the velocity and pressure finite element spaces for the continuous problem are  $\mathcal{V}_0 := H_0^1(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}_0 := L^2(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}_0 := \mathcal{V}_0 \times \mathcal{Q}_0$ . We shall be interested also in the larger spaces  $\mathcal{V} := H^1(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathcal{Q} := L^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathcal{W} := \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{Q}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}, p] \in \mathcal{W}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{v}, q] \in \mathcal{W}_0$ . The variational statement for problem (1)–(2) can be written in terms of the bilinear form defined on  $\mathcal{W}_0 \times \mathcal{W}_0$  as

$$B(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) := \nu(\nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{v}) + (\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - (p, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) + (q, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}). \quad (4)$$

Problem (1)–(2) with the homogeneous Dirichlet condition consists then in finding  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{W}_0$  such that

$$B(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) = \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v} \rangle =: L(\mathbf{V}), \quad \forall \mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{W}_0. \quad (5)$$

The standard Galerkin approximation of this abstract variational problem is now straightforward. Let  $\mathcal{P}_h$  denote a finite element partition of the domain  $\Omega$ . The diameter of an element domain  $K \in \mathcal{P}_h$  is denoted by  $h_K$  and the diameter of the finite element partition by  $h = \max\{h_K \mid K \in \mathcal{P}_h\}$ . For simplicity, we assume that all the element shapes are quadrilaterals or hexahedra. On  $K$  we define the polynomial spaces  $R_k(K)$  where, as usual,  $R_k = P_k$  for simplicial elements and  $R_k = Q_k$  for quadrilaterals and hexahedra. From these polynomial spaces we can construct the conforming finite element spaces  $\mathcal{V}_h \subset \mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_h \subset \mathcal{Q}$  in the usual manner, as well as the corresponding subspaces  $\mathcal{V}_{h,0}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_{h,0}$ . In principle, functions in  $\mathcal{V}_h$  are continuous, whereas functions in  $\mathcal{Q}_h$  not necessarily. Likewise, the orders  $k$  of these spaces may be different.

The discrete version of problem (5) is: find  $\mathbf{U}_h \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}$  such that

$$B(\mathbf{U}_h, \mathbf{V}_h) = L(\mathbf{V}_h), \quad \forall \mathbf{V}_h \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}. \quad (6)$$

The well posedness of this problem relies on the ellipticity of the viscous term and the inf–sup or Babuška–Brezzi condition (see [7]), which can be shown to hold for the continuous problem. The first property is automatically inherited by its discrete counterpart. However, the inf–sup condition needs to be explicitly required. This leads to the need of using mixed interpolations, that is, different for  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $p$ , and verifying

$$\inf_{q_h \in \mathcal{Q}_{h,0}} \sup_{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathcal{V}_{h,0}} \frac{(q_h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h)}{\|q_h\| \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_1} \geq \beta > 0, \quad (7)$$

for a constant  $\beta$  independent of  $h$ .

From the computational point of view, and also when Eq. (1) is generalized to include for example zero order terms in  $\mathbf{u}$ , it is convenient to use the same interpolation for the velocity and the pressure. This choice turns out to violate condition (7). This is why many of the so-called *stabilized* formulations have been proposed to approximate problem (5). The idea is to replace (6) by another discrete variational problem in which the bilinear form  $B$  is replaced by a possibly mesh dependent bilinear form  $B_h$  with enhanced stability properties. Examples of these type of methods are those of Brezzi and Pitkäranta [10], Brezzi and Douglas [6], Douglas and Wang [20], the Galerkin/least-squares

(GLS) technique of Hughes et al. [28], Franca et al. [21,22] and first-order system least-squares methods (see e.g. [4] and references therein).

The second source of instability in the approximation of the Oseen equations arises because of the convective term. When it dominates the viscous one, the stability the latter provides is not enough to have control on the numerical solution and spurious oscillations may appear. Several strategies have been devised to overcome this problem, starting with the classical upwind discretizations. One of the most popular methods to stabilize convection in the finite element context is the so-called SUPG method [12]. Variants of this stabilization mechanism, which also allow to use equal velocity–pressure interpolation, can be found in [14,23,29,30].

In the next section, one of such stabilized formulations is described. It is based on the subgrid scale approach introduced by Hughes in [26,27] for the scalar convection–diffusion equation. The basic idea is to approximate the *effect* of the component of the continuous solution which cannot be resolved by the finite element mesh on the discrete finite element solution. An important feature of the formulation developed herein is that the unresolved subscales are assumed to be  $L^2$  orthogonal to the finite element space. It turns out that for the Stokes problem (that is, when convection is absent) this method reduces to the one presented in [18], which was motivated by a completely different reasoning. After having stated two different variants of the proposed formulation, a complete numerical analysis of these is undertaken, showing its stability and convergence properties. Optimal *a priori* convergence estimates are proven for the  $h$ -version of the method. A third formulation, which is only intended to stabilize the pressure, is also analyzed. Two numerical examples are presented in Section 4 to show the good performance of the first of these formulations and finally some conclusions are drawn.

## 2. Description of the method

### 2.1. Algebraic subgrid scale methods

The finite element formulation to be analyzed in this paper has its roots in the so-called multiscale formulations of the problem [26,27]. The basic idea is to approximate the continuous space  $\mathcal{W}$  by  $\mathcal{W}_h \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{W}}$ , where  $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}$  is an approximation to the complement of  $\mathcal{W}_h$  in  $\mathcal{W}$ . Likewise,  $\mathcal{W}_0$  is approximated by  $\mathcal{W}_{h,0} \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_0$ , with  $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_0$  an approximation to the complement of  $\mathcal{W}_{h,0}$  in  $\mathcal{W}_0$ . The space  $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_0$  will be called the space of *subgrid scales* or *subscales*. Assuming these are zero on the element boundaries, a possible way to construct  $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_0$  is by *bubble functions*. This leads to the modified discrete problem

$$B(U_h, V_h) + \sum_K \int_K \tilde{U} \cdot \mathcal{L}^*(V_h) \, d\Omega = L(V_h), \quad (8)$$

where  $\sum_K$  stands for the summation over all  $K \in \mathcal{P}_h$ ,  $\mathcal{L}^*$  is the formal adjoint of the Oseen operator, which for divergence free advection velocities is given by

$$\mathcal{L}^*(V_h) = \begin{bmatrix} -\nu \Delta \mathbf{v}_h - \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_h - \nabla q_h \\ -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h \end{bmatrix},$$

and  $\tilde{U}$  is the subscale to be approximated. Either the use of bubble functions or the approximation of the problem's Green function suggest to take  $\tilde{U}$  as [9]

$$\tilde{U} = \tau_K [F - \mathcal{L}(U_h)] \quad \text{in } K \in \mathcal{P}_h, \quad (9)$$

$\mathcal{L}$  being the Oseen operator and  $\tau_K$  a matrix of numerical parameters defined for each element domain  $K \in \mathcal{P}_h$ , which we will take as

$$\tau_K = \text{diag}(\tau_{1,K}, \tau_{2,K}), \quad \tau_{1,K} = \tau_{1,K} \mathbf{I}_d, \quad (10)$$

$$\tau_{1,K} = \left[ \frac{c_1 \nu}{h_{K,\min}^2} + \frac{c_2 |\mathbf{a}|_{\infty,K}}{h_{K,\min}} \right]^{-1}, \quad (11)$$

$$\tau_{2,K} = c_3 \nu + c_4 |\mathbf{a}|_{\infty,K} h_{K,\min}, \quad (12)$$

where  $c_i$  are constants ( $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ), on which precise conditions will be given later on,  $\mathbf{I}_d$  is the  $d \times d$  identity matrix,  $|\mathbf{a}|_{\infty,K}$  is the maximum of the Euclidean norm of  $\mathbf{a}$  in the element domain  $K$  and  $h_{K,\min}$  is a function of

the element diameter  $h_K$  which will be also precised later. The lack of analytical knowledge in the design of  $\tau_K$  will be substituted by the convergence analysis, which will establish whether this particular form is adequate or not. A heuristic justification of (9)–(12) based on a Fourier analysis of the problem of which  $\tilde{U}$  is solution can be found in [17].

At this point it is convenient to introduce some notation. For a set of symmetric and positive-definite matrices  $\{\tau_K, K \in \mathcal{P}_h\}$ , we define the inner product weighted by these matrices and its associated norm by

$$(X, Y)_\tau := \sum_K (\tau_K X, Y)_K, \quad \|Y\|_\tau := \sqrt{(Y, Y)_\tau}. \quad (13)$$

In these expressions, the functions  $X$  are  $Y$  need not being continuous for the local  $L^2$  products to make sense. The inner product in (13) will play an essential role in the analysis of the following section. We may introduce also the inner products  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\tau_i}$ , defined as in (13) using the elementwise value of the scalar algorithmic parameters  $\tau_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ). This allows us to write problem (8) with the subscales approximated by (9) as

$$B_{\text{asgs}}(U_h, V_h) = L_{\text{asgs}}(V_h) \quad \forall V_h \in \mathcal{W}_0, \quad (14)$$

where

$$B_{\text{asgs}}(U_h, V_h) := B(U_h, V_h) + (-v \Delta u_h + a \cdot \nabla u_h + \nabla p_h, v \Delta v_h + a \cdot \nabla v_h + \nabla q_h)_{\tau_1} + (\nabla \cdot u_h, \nabla \cdot v_h)_{\tau_2}, \quad (15)$$

$$L_{\text{asgs}}(V_h) := L(V_h) + (f, v \Delta v_h + a \cdot \nabla v_h + \nabla q_h)_{\tau_1}. \quad (16)$$

A version of this method, including also zero order terms coming from Coriolis forces and permeability effects, is analyzed in [16].

## 2.2. Orthogonal subscales

It is shown in [15] that (9) can in fact be generalized to

$$\tilde{U} = \tau_K [F - \mathcal{L}(U_h)] + \tau_K V_{h,\text{ort}} \quad \text{in } K \in \mathcal{P}_h, \quad (17)$$

where  $V_{h,\text{ort}}$  is any element orthogonal to  $\mathcal{W}_0$  (here and below, orthogonality is understood with respect to the  $L^2$  inner product, unless otherwise specified).

Let us call  $\Pi_\tau$  the projection onto  $\mathcal{W}_h$  associated to the inner product in (13), hereafter referred to as  $\tau$ -projection. Likewise, we will denote by  $\Pi_{\tau,0}$  the  $\tau$ -projection onto  $\mathcal{W}_{h,0}$  and  $\Pi_\tau^\perp := I - \Pi_\tau$ , where  $I$  is the identity in  $\mathcal{W}_h$ . If  $\tilde{W}$  is selected to be approximately orthogonal to  $\mathcal{W}_h$ , it can be shown that [15]

$$V_{h,\text{ort}} = -\Pi_\tau [F - \mathcal{L}(U_h)]. \quad (18)$$

The numerical formulation to be analyzed in this paper is obtained by using this in (17) and neglecting the orthogonal  $\tau$ -projection of the viscous and force terms. The former are exactly zero for linear elements and for higher order interpolations disregarding them leads to a method which is still consistent (in a sense explained later; cf. Remark 3). The final *stabilized* formulation consists of finding  $U_h \in \mathcal{W}_0$  such that

$$B_I(U_h, V_h) = L(V_h) \quad \forall V_h \in \mathcal{W}_0, \quad (19)$$

where the bilinear form  $B_I$  is given by

$$B_I(U_h, V_h) = B(U_h, V_h) + (\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp (a \cdot \nabla u_h + \nabla p_h), a \cdot \nabla v_h + \nabla q_h)_{\tau_1} + (\Pi_{\tau_2}^\perp (\nabla \cdot u_h), \nabla \cdot v_h)_{\tau_2}, \quad (20)$$

where  $B$  is defined in (4). Here and in what follows, the symbols  $\Pi_{\tau_i}$ ,  $\Pi_{\tau_i,0}$  and  $\Pi_{\tau_i}^\perp$  are used for the projections onto  $\mathcal{V}_h$ ,  $\mathcal{V}_{h,0}$  and  $\mathcal{V}_h^\perp$ , for  $i = 1$ , and onto  $\mathcal{Q}_h$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}_{h,0}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_h^\perp$ , for  $i = 2$ . These projections are computed with the inner products  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\tau_i}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , respectively.

Once arrived to (20) it is observed that what the present method provides with respect to the standard Galerkin method is a *least-squares control on the component of the terms  $a \cdot \nabla u_h + \nabla p_h$  and  $\nabla \cdot u_h$  orthogonal to the corresponding finite element spaces* with respect to the appropriate inner product. The objective of this paper is to analyze

this formulation and to show that it is stable and optimally convergent. In spite of the fact that this analysis is different from that of the more classical method (14), mainly because  $B_I$  will not be globally coercive, we will obtain the same error estimates using different arguments. The differences in the implementation of (14) and (19) are discussed in Remark 2 below.

There is a simple modification of the bilinear form (20) which leads to another stabilized method with slightly better stability properties. The idea is to control separately the components of  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h$  and  $\nabla p_h$   $\tau_1$ -orthogonal to  $\mathcal{V}_h$ . The bilinear form associated to this method is

$$B_{II}(\mathbf{U}_h, \mathbf{V}_h) = B(\mathbf{U}_h, \mathbf{V}_h) + (\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h), \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_h)_{\tau_1} \\ + (\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\nabla p_h), \nabla q_h)_{\tau_1} + (\Pi_{\tau_2}^\perp(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_h), \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h)_{\tau_2}. \quad (21)$$

Dropping the orthogonal projections  $\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp$  and  $\Pi_{\tau_2}^\perp$ , the method reduces to a general version of that analyzed in [14], which has a consistency error that makes it only applicable with  $P_1$  elements. Likewise, when the convective term is absent the method coincides with that analyzed in [18] for the Stokes problem. In this situation, and when the meshes are made of patches of  $2 \times 2$  quadrilaterals (in 2D), it is shown in [2] that the projections can be computed locally on each patch. Finally, let us mention the method proposed in [13] to stabilize convection which, like the stabilization of the convective term in (21), does not involve the whole residual of the equation to be solved.

**Remark 1.** Both methods I and II could be slightly modified by projecting onto  $\mathcal{W}_{h,0}$  in (18) instead of projecting onto  $\mathcal{W}_h$ . This would simplify the analysis presented in the following section, since the stability condition (35) stated there would not be needed, and all the results to be presented carry over to this case. However, even though the global convergence is optimal, projecting onto  $\mathcal{W}_{h,0}$  leads to spurious numerical boundary layers, similar to those found for the pressure in classical fractional step schemes for the transient problem (see for example [25]). Further discussion about this point can be found in [18].

### 2.3. Matrix form of the discrete problem

In order to highlight the modifications of the stabilized methods I and II (associated to the bilinear forms  $B_I$  and  $B_{II}$ , respectively) with respect to the standard Galerkin method, we consider here the matrix form of all these methods.

The matrix form of the Galerkin method is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K} + \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{G} \\ \mathbf{D} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U} \\ \mathbf{P} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{P}$  are the arrays of nodal velocities and pressures, respectively,  $\mathbf{K}$  is the matrix arising from the viscous term,  $\mathbf{A}$  from the advection term,  $\mathbf{G}$  from the pressure gradient,  $\mathbf{D}$  from the velocity divergence and  $\mathbf{F}$  is the resulting vector of nodal forces. Here and in the following we assume that the modifications on the first equation to account for the boundary conditions have not yet been performed.

Let us consider now method I, for simplicity with  $\tau_{1,K} \equiv \tau_1$  constant for all the elements and  $\tau_{2,K} = 0$ . The practical way to compute the orthogonal  $\tau_1$ -projection  $\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp$  is to compute  $\Pi_{\tau_1}$  and then use  $\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp = I - \Pi_{\tau_1}$ . Therefore, if we call  $\xi_h$  the  $\tau_1$ -projection of  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h + \nabla p_h$  onto  $\mathcal{V}_h$  (which for  $\tau_1$  constant is equal to the  $L^2$ -projection) method I consists in fact of three discrete variational equations which allow to find  $[\mathbf{u}_h, p_h, \xi_h] \in \mathcal{V}_{h,0} \times \mathcal{Q}_{h,0} \times \mathcal{V}_h$ , namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\nabla \mathbf{u}_h, \nabla \mathbf{v}_h) + (\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) + (\nabla p_h, \mathbf{v}_h) + \tau_1(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h + \nabla p_h - \xi_h, \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_h) &= \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle, \\ (q_h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_h) + \tau_1(\nabla q_h, \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h + \nabla p_h - \xi_h) &= 0, \\ (\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h + \nabla p_h, \eta_h) - (\xi_h, \eta_h) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

which must hold for all  $[\mathbf{v}_h, q_h, \eta_h] \in \mathcal{V}_{h,0} \times \mathcal{Q}_{h,0} \times \mathcal{V}_h$ . If we denote by a subscript  $a$  the matrices arising from terms weighted by  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_h$  (which suggests ‘derivative with respect to  $\mathbf{a}$ ’) and by subscript  $d$  the matrices arising from terms weighted by  $-\nabla q_h$  (suggesting the ‘divergence’), it is easy to see that the matrix version of the previous equations is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K} + \mathbf{A} + \tau_1 \mathbf{A}_a & \mathbf{G} + \tau_1 \mathbf{G}_a & -\tau_1 \mathbf{M}_a \\ \mathbf{D} - \tau_1 \mathbf{A}_d & -\tau_1 \mathbf{G}_d & \tau_1 \mathbf{M}_d \\ \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{G} & -\mathbf{M} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U} \\ \mathbf{P} \\ \xi \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (22)$$

where  $M$  is the Gramm matrix of the finite element interpolation, and thus  $M_a$  and  $M_d$  the matrices obtained by replacing the test function  $\eta_h$  by  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla v_h$  and  $-\nabla q_h$ , respectively.

The algebraic problem (22) can be solved using a block iteration algorithm segregating the calculation of  $\mathcal{E}$  from that of  $U$  and  $P$ . However, if an iterative solver is used, it is also feasible to solve it in a direct monolithic way. The array  $\mathcal{E}$  can be formally condensed to yield the system

$$\begin{bmatrix} K + A + \tau_1(A_a - M_a M^{-1}A) & G + \tau_1(G_a - M_a M^{-1}G) \\ D + \tau_1(M_d M^{-1}A - A_d) & \tau_1(M_d M^{-1}G - G_d) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} U \\ P \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} F \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

Iterative solvers for this system only require the evaluation of matrix–vector products. The only point to be considered when solving (23) is the evaluation of  $M^{-1}Z = Y$  for a given array  $Z$ , which implies solving the system  $Z = MY$ . This can be done very efficiently using Jacobi iterations and taking as preconditioner a diagonal approximation to  $M$ . Usually, two or three iterations are sufficient, and their computational cost in the overall calculation is negligible. This is the approach we have followed in the numerical examples.

Let us consider now method II, which consists of finding  $[u_h, p_h, \xi_{h,1}, \xi_{h,2}] \in \mathcal{V}_{h,0} \times \mathcal{Q}_{h,0} \times \mathcal{V}_h \times \mathcal{V}_h$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} v(\nabla u_h, \nabla v_h) + (\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla u_h, v_h) + (\nabla p_h, v_h) + \tau_1(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla u_h - \xi_{h,1}, \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla v_h) &= \langle f, v_h \rangle, \\ (q_h, \nabla \cdot u_h) + \tau_1(\nabla q_h, \nabla p_h - \xi_{h,2}) &= 0, \\ (\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla u_h, \eta_{h,1}) - (\xi_{h,1}, \eta_{h,1}) &= 0, \\ (\nabla p_h, \eta_{h,2}) - (\xi_{h,2}, \eta_{h,2}) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

for all  $[v_h, q_h, \eta_{h,1}, \eta_{h,2}] \in \mathcal{V}_{h,0} \times \mathcal{Q}_{h,0} \times \mathcal{V}_h \times \mathcal{V}_h$ . The matrix version of this discrete variational problem is

$$\begin{bmatrix} K + A + \tau_1 A_a & G & -\tau_1 M_a & 0 \\ D & -\tau_1 G_d & 0 & \tau_1 M_d \\ A & 0 & -M & 0 \\ 0 & G & 0 & -M \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} U \\ P \\ \mathcal{E}_1 \\ \mathcal{E}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} F \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (24)$$

and the condensed counterpart is

$$\begin{bmatrix} K + A + \tau_1(A_a - M_a M^{-1}A) & G + \tau_1(G_a - M_a M^{-1}G) \\ D + \tau_1(M_d M^{-1}A - A_d) & \tau_1(M_d M^{-1}G - G_d) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} U \\ P \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} F \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

The difference in the terms introduced by methods I and II is clearly observed by comparing (22) and (24) or (23) and (25). It is seen that method II introduces less terms, but two projections onto  $\mathcal{V}_h$  need to be performed.

**Remark 2.** After having described the algebraic problem obtained from the stabilization with orthogonal subscales, it is important to mention the differences with the more usual method (14), which is similar to the classical SUPG or GLS methods. First of all, in these cases the *whole* element residual needs to be computed within each element. In particular, second-order derivatives of the shape functions have to be computed and stored for higher order elements, a cumbersome and time consuming process. Likewise, the right-hand side of the algebraic system needs to be modified. The advantage with respect to method (19) analyzed here is that no variables other than the velocity and the pressure need to be dealt with. In particular, no projections need to be performed. The relative importance of these two facts depends on the numerical example being solved.

### 3. Numerical analysis

#### 3.1. Preliminaries

In this section we prove that methods I and II are stable and optimally convergent. We will consider also a slight modification of these methods that is only intended to stabilize the pressure, and therefore with poor stability properties for convection dominated flows. However, this method allows us to prove convergence in a finer norm than for methods I and II.

Let us state now some properties of the family of finite element partitions  $\mathcal{F} := \{\mathcal{P}_h \mid h > 0\}$  that we will use. First, we assume that  $\mathcal{F}$  is nondegenerate (that is, the quotient  $h_K/\varrho_K$  remains bounded, with  $\varrho_K$  the diameter of the ball inscribed in  $K$ ), and therefore the inverse estimate

$$\|\nabla v_h\|_K \leq \frac{C_{\text{inv}}}{h_K} \|v_h\|_K, \quad K \in \mathcal{P}_h, \quad (26)$$

holds for any finite element function  $v_h$  (see, e.g., [5]).

The precise conditions we will need for the constants  $c_i$  in (11) and (12) can be written in terms of the constant  $C_{\text{inv}}$  in the inverse estimate (26). Although other choices for these conditions are possible, we will assume that

$$c_1 = \alpha^2 C_{\text{inv}}^2, \quad c_2 = \alpha C_{\text{inv}}, \quad \text{with } \alpha > 1, \quad (27)$$

$$c_3 = \sigma, \quad c_4 = \frac{\sigma}{\alpha C_{\text{inv}}}, \quad \text{with } 0 < \sigma \leq 1. \quad (28)$$

We shall restrict our attention to interpolations of degree  $k$  for both the velocity and the pressure, although the extension to different velocity–pressure interpolations offers no difficulty, provided the pressure interpolation is continuous.

We will need the following approximation property: for any function  $v$  in  $H^r(\Omega)$ ,  $0 \leq r \leq k+1$ , there exists a finite element interpolant  $\hat{v}_h$  such that

$$\|v - \hat{v}_h\|_{m,K} \leq C_I h_K^{n-m} \|v\|_{H^n(S_K)}, \quad 0 \leq n \leq r, \quad 0 \leq m \leq n,$$

for  $K \in \mathcal{P}_h$ , where  $C_I$  is a positive constant and  $S_K$  is the patch of elements neighboring  $K$  and  $m, n, r$  are integers [5]. For  $n \geq 2$  and  $d = 2, 3$ ,  $\hat{v}_h$  can be taken as the standard nodal interpolant and  $S_K$  can be replaced by  $K$ .

For nondegenerate  $\mathcal{F}$  the patches are quasi-uniform, that is, there exist positive constants  $C$  and  $C'$  such that (cf. [1, Theorem 1.9]):

$$Ch_{K'} \leq h_K \leq C'h_{K'}, \quad \forall K' \in S_K, \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{P}_h, \quad (29)$$

which allows us to write the interpolation estimate as

$$\|v - \hat{v}_h\|_{m,K} \leq C_I \sum_{K' \subset S_K} h_K^{n-m} \|v\|_{H^n(S_{K'})}, \quad 0 \leq n \leq r, \quad 0 \leq m \leq n, \quad (30)$$

for  $K \in \mathcal{P}_h$ . Likewise, (29) is the basic ingredient to prove the following property of the family  $\mathcal{F}$ :

**Lemma 1.** Let  $\mathbf{x}_K$  be the coordinates of the barycenter of an element domain  $K$ . If the family of finite element partitions  $\mathcal{F}$  is nondegenerate, then there exist functions  $\chi_1, \chi_2$ , with  $\chi_1(\cdot, h), \chi_2(\cdot, h) \in C^0(\Omega)$  for all  $h > 0$ , such that

$$h_{K,\min} := \chi_1(\mathbf{x}_K, h) \leq h_K \leq \chi_2(\mathbf{x}_K, h), \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{P}_h, \quad h > 0,$$

$$\sup_{h>0} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} \frac{\chi_2(\mathbf{x}, h)}{\chi_1(\mathbf{x}, h)} \leq \chi_0 < \infty.$$

**Proof.** Let  $a$  be a vertex node of the finite element partition and let  $h_a$  be the average of the element diameters of the elements to which  $a$  belongs. If  $H(\mathbf{x}, h)$  is the piecewise continuous interpolation of degree one from the nodal values  $h_a$ , (29) implies that

$$A_1 H(\mathbf{x}_K, h) \leq h_K \leq A_2 H(\mathbf{x}_K, h)$$

for constants  $A_1, A_2 > 0$ . The result follows taking  $\chi_i(\mathbf{x}, h) = A_i H(\mathbf{x}, h)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  (and  $\chi_0 = A_2/A_1$ ).  $\square$

Observe that  $h_{K,\min}$  appears in the definition of the stabilization parameters (11) and (12) (other choices are also possible by modifying conditions (27) and (28)). From the continuity of  $\mathbf{a}$  and (29), these parameters will satisfy

$$C\tau_{i,K'} \leq \tau_{i,K} \leq C'\tau_{i,K'}, \quad \forall K' \in S_K, \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{P}_h, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (31)$$



for constants  $C, C' > 0$ , not necessarily the same as before. In what follows,  $C$  denotes a positive constant, independent of the mesh size  $h$  and of the coefficients of the differential equation. The value of  $C$  may vary in its different appearances.

Lemma 1 allows us to make the following construction. For each  $h > 0$ , let  $\mathcal{N}_h$  be the set of nodal points of the partition  $\mathcal{P}_h$ . Scalar continuous finite element functions are uniquely determined by their values at the nodes in  $\mathcal{N}_h$ . Likewise, we denote by  $\mathcal{N}_K$  the set of nodes in an element domain  $K \in \mathcal{P}_h$ . If  $a$  is a node, with coordinates  $\mathbf{x}_a$ , we may now construct a set of algorithmic parameters  $\{\bar{\tau}_{i,a} \mid a \in \mathcal{N}_h, i = 1, 2\}$ , where  $\tau_{i,a}$  is simply defined by replacing in (11)–(12) the element parameter  $h_{K,\min}$  by  $\chi_1(\mathbf{x}_a, h)$  and  $|\mathbf{a}|_{\infty,K}$  by the Euclidean norm of  $\mathbf{a}$  evaluated at  $\mathbf{x}_a$ .

To prove stability (cf. Theorems 1, 3, 5), we will need in particular to take the velocity test function close to  $\tau_{1,K} \Pi_{\tau_{1,0}}(\xi_h)$  within each element domain  $K$  (for certain  $\xi_h$ ). Unfortunately, these functions are discontinuous, and therefore we will need to approximate them by continuous functions, belonging to the finite element space. We construct these approximations as follows. Let  $N_a(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ , be the standard shape (basis) function associated to node  $a \in \mathcal{N}_h$ . A finite element function  $v_h$  can be thus written as

$$v_h(\mathbf{x})|_K = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{N}_K} N_a(\mathbf{x})|_K v^a, \quad K \in \mathcal{P}_h,$$

where  $\{v^a \mid a \in \mathcal{N}_K\}$  is the set of element nodal parameters of  $v_h$ . From  $\{\bar{\tau}_{i,a} \mid a \in \mathcal{N}_h, i = 1, 2\}$  and  $\{\tau_{i,K} \mid K \in \mathcal{P}_h, i = 1, 2\}$  we define

$$\tau \circ v_h \quad \text{by} \quad \tau \circ v_h(\mathbf{x})|_K := \tau_K v_h(\mathbf{x})|_K, \quad (32)$$

$$\tau \diamond v_h \quad \text{by} \quad \tau \diamond v_h(\mathbf{x})|_K := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{N}_K} N_a(\mathbf{x})|_K \bar{\tau}_a v^a. \quad (33)$$

Here and in the following result  $\tau$  may be either  $\tau_1$  or  $\tau_2$ :

**Lemma 2.** Assume that the family  $\mathcal{F}$  of finite element partitions is nondegenerate. Then, for any finite element function  $v_h$ , the functions  $\tau \circ v_h$  and  $\tau \diamond v_h$  defined in (32) and (33), respectively, satisfy

$$\|\tau \circ v_h - \tau \diamond v_h\|_K \leq \tau_K \psi(h) \|v_h\|_K, \quad (34)$$

where  $\psi(h) \rightarrow 0$  as  $h \rightarrow 0$ .

Register for free at <https://www.scipedia.com> to download the version without the watermark

**Proof.** For any piecewise continuous finite element function  $w_h$  we have that

$$C_1 h_K^{d/2} \|w_h\|_{L^\infty(K)} \leq \|w_h\|_{L^2(K)} \leq C_2 h_K^{d/2} \|w_h\|_{L^\infty(K)},$$

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are positive constants. The first inequality is an inverse estimate valid for nondegenerate  $\mathcal{F}$  (see [5]) and the second is obvious. Using this we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} C_2^{-1} h_K^{-d/2} \|\tau \circ v_h - \tau \diamond v_h\|_{L^2(K)} &\leq \|\tau \circ v_h - \tau \diamond v_h\|_{L^\infty(K)} \\ &= \left\| \sum_{a \in \mathcal{N}_K} (\tau_K - \bar{\tau}_a) N_a(\mathbf{x}) v^a \right\|_{L^\infty(K)} \\ &\leq \tau_K \max_{a \in \mathcal{N}_K} \left| \frac{\bar{\tau}_a}{\tau_K} - 1 \right| \left\| \sum_{a \in \mathcal{N}_K} |N_a(\mathbf{x}) v^a| \right\|_{L^\infty(K)} \\ &\leq C \tau_K \max_{a \in \mathcal{N}_K} \left| \frac{\bar{\tau}_a}{\tau_K} - 1 \right| \|v_h\|_{L^\infty(K)} \\ &\leq C \tau_K \max_{a \in \mathcal{N}_K} \left| \frac{\bar{\tau}_a}{\tau_K} - 1 \right| C_1^{-1} h_K^{-d/2} \|v_h\|_{L^2(K)}, \end{aligned}$$

for a positive constant  $C$ . From the continuity assumed for the advection velocity  $\mathbf{a}$  we have that  $\bar{\tau}_a \rightarrow \tau_K$  as  $h \rightarrow 0$ , and the result follows.  $\square$

This result and definitions (32) and (33) are also valid when  $v_h$  is a vector function. We have thus constructed a continuous function  $\tau \diamond v_h$  that approximates  $\tau \circ v_h$  when the mesh diameter goes to zero.



The final assumption is that we will assume that there is a constant  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that

$$\|z_h\|_{\tau_1} \leq \frac{1}{\beta_0} \|\Pi_{\tau_1,0}(z_h) + \Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(z_h)\|_{\tau_1}, \quad z_h \equiv \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_h + \nabla q_h, \quad (35)$$

for all  $[\mathbf{v}_h, q_h] \in \mathcal{V}_{h,0} \times \mathcal{Q}_{h,0}$  and for  $h > 0$ . This condition means that a bound for the norms of  $\Pi_{\tau_1,0}(z_h)$  and  $\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(z_h)$  is enough to bound the whole norm of vector  $z_h$ , which in turn implies that the component of  $z_h$  in  $\mathcal{V}_h$  which is  $\tau_1$ -orthogonal to  $\mathcal{V}_{h,0}$  is not independent of the other two components,  $\Pi_{\tau_1,0}(z_h)$  and  $\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(z_h)$ .

We will not pursue a study of this condition in this paper. The assumption that it holds will be one of the hypothesis of the analysis presented below. Let us only mention that exactly the same analysis as in [18] can be applied here, and can be used to prove that it holds for example in the case of  $P_k$  elements. Nevertheless, we insist on the fact that this condition is not essential, in the sense explained in Remark 1.

For  $z_h = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h$  (now a scalar), and replacing  $\tau_{1,K}$  by  $\tau_{2,K}$ , it is trivially verified that (35) always holds with  $\beta_0 = 1$ , since  $\mathbf{v}_h = \mathbf{0}$  on  $\partial\Omega$  implies that  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h$  has zero mean, and therefore  $\Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h) = \Pi_{\tau_2}(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h)$ . However, to keep the notation compact, we will use also (35) in this case.

The stability condition (35) completes the set of assumptions that will be used in the following. For future reference, let us collect them:

H1. The advection velocity  $\mathbf{a}$  is in  $\mathcal{C}^0(\bar{\Omega})$  and weakly divergence free.

H2. There is a constant  $C_D$  such that the  $k+1$  derivatives of  $\mathbf{a}$  within element  $K$  are bounded above by  $C_D|\mathbf{a}|_{\infty,K}$ ,  $K \in \mathcal{P}_h$ .

H3. The family  $\mathcal{F}$  of finite element partitions is nondegenerate.

H4. The stability condition (35) holds.

H5. The algorithmic parameters  $\tau_{1,K}$  and  $\tau_{2,K}$  are given by (11) and (12), respectively, with the constants  $c_i$  given by (27)–(28).

H6. The data are such that the exact velocity components are in  $H^{k+1}(\Omega)$  and the exact pressure in  $H^k(\Omega)$ ,  $k \geq 1$ .

Assumption H6 will only be needed to prove that convergence is optimal when finite element interpolations of degree  $k$  are used. We will call

Register for free at <https://www.scipedia.com> to download the version without the watermark

The ultimate purpose of the analysis below is to show that this is the error function (in norms to be defined) of the different methods considered.

### 3.2. Method I

The problem in this case is stated in (19). We prove now that this method is stable and convergent in the mesh dependent norm

$$\|\mathbf{V}_h\|_I \equiv \|[\mathbf{v}_h, q_h]\|_I := v^{1/2} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_h\| + \|\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_h + \nabla q_h\|_{\tau_1} + \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h\|_{\tau_2}. \quad (37)$$

**Theorem 1** (Stability of method I). *Under assumptions H1, H3, H4 and H5, there is a constant  $\beta_I > 0$  such that, for  $h$  sufficiently small and  $\alpha$  in (27)–(28) large enough,*

$$\inf_{\mathbf{U}_h \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}} \sup_{\mathbf{V}_h \in \mathcal{V}_{h,0}} \frac{B_I(\mathbf{U}_h, \mathbf{V}_h)}{\|\mathbf{U}_h\|_I \|\mathbf{V}_h\|_I} \geq \beta_I. \quad (38)$$

**Proof.** Fix  $\mathbf{U}_h \equiv [\mathbf{u}_h, p_h] \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}$ , arbitrary, and let us introduce the abbreviations  $\xi_h \equiv \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h + \nabla p_h$ ,  $\delta_h \equiv \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_h$ . From the definition of  $B_I$  it follows that

$$B_I([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\mathbf{u}_h, p_h]) = v \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|^2 + \|\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\xi_h)\|_{\tau_1}^2 + \|\Pi_{\tau_2}^\perp(\delta_h)\|_{\tau_2}^2. \quad (39)$$

Clearly,  $B_I$  is not coercive in the norm (37). All we can expect is stability in the form given by (38). If now we take  $[\mathbf{v}_h, q_h] = [\tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h), \tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)]$  it is found that

$$\begin{aligned}
& B_I([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h), \tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)]) \\
&= v(\nabla \mathbf{u}_h, \nabla [\tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h)]) + (\xi_h, \tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h)) + (\xi_h, \tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h) - \tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h)) \\
&\quad + (\tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h), \delta_h) + (\tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h) - \tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h), \delta_h) \\
&\quad + (\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla [\tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h)], \Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\xi_h))_{\tau_1} + (\nabla [\tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)], \Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\xi_h))_{\tau_1} \\
&\quad + (\nabla \cdot [\tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h)], \Pi_{\tau_2}^\perp(\delta_h))_{\tau_2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Note that

$$(\xi_h, \tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h)) = (\xi_h, \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h))_{\tau_1} = \|\Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h)\|_{\tau_1}^2,$$

and, similarly,  $(\tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h), \delta_h) = \|\Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)\|_{\tau_2}^2$ . This, Schwarz's inequality and the inverse estimate (26) in (40) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
& B_I([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h), \tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)]) \\
&\geq - \sum_K \frac{C_{\text{inv}}}{h_K} v \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|_K \|\tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h)\|_K \\
&\quad + \|\Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h)\|_{\tau_1}^2 - \sum_K \|\xi_h\|_K \|\tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h) - \tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h)\|_K \\
&\quad + \|\Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)\|_{\tau_2}^2 - \sum_K \|\delta_h\|_K \|\tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h) - \tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)\|_K \\
&\quad - \sum_K \frac{C_{\text{inv}}}{h_K} |\mathbf{a}|_{\infty,K} \tau_{1,K} \|\tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h)\|_K \|\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\xi_h)\|_K - \sum_K \frac{C_{\text{inv}}}{h_K} \tau_{1,K} \|\tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)\|_K \|\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\xi_h)\|_K \\
&\quad - \sum_K \frac{C_{\text{inv}}}{h_K} \tau_{2,K} \|\tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h)\|_K \|\Pi_{\tau_2}^\perp(\delta_h)\|_K.
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

The bounds (27)–(28) assumed for the constants  $c_i$  in the definition of  $\tau_{1,K}$  and  $\tau_{2,K}$  imply

Register for free at <https://www.scipedia.com> to download the version without the watermark

Using these inequalities, Lemma 2 (which implies that  $\|\tau \diamond v_h\| \leq \tau_K (1 + \psi(h)) \|v_h\|_K$ ), and the arithmetic–geometric inequality, it can be readily verified that

$$\begin{aligned}
& B_I([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h), \tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)]) \\
&\geq -\frac{1}{2\alpha} [1 + \psi(h)] v \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|^2 + \left[ 1 - \frac{3}{2\alpha} [1 + \psi(h)] - \frac{1}{2} \psi(h) \right] \|\Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h)\|_{\tau_1}^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\alpha} [1 + \psi(h)] \|\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\xi_h)\|_{\tau_1}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \psi(h) \|\xi_h\|_{\tau_1}^2 + \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha} [1 + \psi(h)] - \frac{1}{2} \psi(h) \right] \|\Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)\|_{\tau_2}^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2\alpha} [1 + \psi(h)] \|\Pi_{\tau_2}^\perp(\delta_h)\|_{\tau_2}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \psi(h) \|\delta_h\|_{\tau_2}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

Let us call  $\mathbf{v}_h^0 \equiv \mathbf{u}_h + \tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h)$ ,  $q_h^0 \equiv q_h + \tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)$ . Adding up (39) and (42), taking  $h$  small enough and  $\alpha$  large enough ( $\alpha > 3/2$ ) so that

$$1 - \frac{3}{2\alpha} [1 + \psi(h)] - \frac{1}{2} \psi(h) \geq C_1 > 0,$$

and using the stability condition (35), we obtain

$$B_I([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\mathbf{v}_h^0, q_h^0]) \geq C_1 v \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|^2 + \left[ \beta_0^2 C_1 - \frac{1}{2} \psi(h) \right] [\|\xi_h\|_{\tau_1}^2 + \|\delta_h\|_{\tau_2}^2],$$

and therefore, if  $h$  is small enough,

$$B_I([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\mathbf{v}_h^0, q_h^0]) \geq C \|\mathbf{u}_h, p_h\|_I^2. \tag{43}$$

On the other hand, using repeatedly the inverse estimate (26), the definition of  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$ , Lemma 2 and the fact that the norm of projection operators is  $\leq 1$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left[ \tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h), \tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h) \right] \right\|_I^2 \\ & \leq \sum_K C \frac{C_{\text{inv}}^2}{h_K^2} [1 + \psi(h)]^2 [(v\tau_{1,K}^2 + 2|a|_{\infty,K}^2 \tau_{1,K}^3 + \tau_{1,K}^2 \tau_{2,K}) \|\Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h)\|_K^2 + 2\tau_{1,K} \tau_{2,K}^2 \|\Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)\|_K^2] \\ & \leq C(\|\xi_h\|_{\tau_1}^2 + \|\delta_h\|_{\tau_2}^2) \\ & \leq C \left\| [\mathbf{u}_h, p_h] \right\|_I^2, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| [\mathbf{v}_h^0, q_h^0] \right\|_I & \leq \left\| [\mathbf{u}_h, p_h] \right\|_I + \left\| [\tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\xi_h), \tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)] \right\|_I \\ & \leq C \left\| [\mathbf{u}_h, p_h] \right\|_I. \end{aligned}$$

The theorem follows using this in (43).  $\square$

Let  $\mathbf{U}$  be the solution of the continuous problem. Since it verifies  $B(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}_h) = \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle$  for all  $\mathbf{V}_h \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}$ , it follows that

$$B_I(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}_h) = \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle + (\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla p), \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_h + \nabla q_h)_{\tau_1} + (\Pi_{\tau_2}^\perp(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}), \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h)_{\tau_2}.$$

Since  $B_I(\mathbf{U}_h, \mathbf{V}_h) = \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle$  it follows that

$$B_I(\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{U}_h, \mathbf{V}_h) = (\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla p), \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_h + \nabla q_h)_{\tau_1} + (\Pi_{\tau_2}^\perp(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}), \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h)_{\tau_2}, \quad (44)$$

from where we see that the method is *not consistent* in the classical variational sense, since the RHS of (44) is not zero. However, the consistency error can be bounded as follows:

**Lemma 3** (Bound for the consistency error of method I). Assume that hypothesis H2, H5 and H6 hold. Then, there is a constant  $C$  (in this case independent of  $\mathbf{U}$ ) such that

$$B_I(\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{U}_h, \mathbf{V}_h) \leq C\varepsilon(h) \left\| \mathbf{V}_h \right\|_I \quad (45)$$

for all  $\mathbf{V}_h \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}$ .

**Proof.** From (44) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} B_I(\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{U}_h, \mathbf{V}_h) & \leq C \|\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_h + \nabla q_h\|_{\tau_1} \|(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla p) - \Pi_{\tau_1}(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla p)\|_{\tau_1} + C \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h\|_{\tau_2} \|(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}) - \Pi_{\tau_2}(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u})\|_{\tau_2} \\ & \leq C \left\| [\mathbf{v}_h, q_h] \right\|_I (\|\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \Pi_{\tau_1}(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u})\|_{\tau_1} + \|\nabla p - \Pi_{\tau_1}(\nabla p)\|_{\tau_1} + \|(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}) - \Pi_{\tau_2}(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u})\|_{\tau_2}), \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\mathbf{V}_h \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}$ . Let  $v \in H^r(\Omega)$ ,  $0 \leq r \leq k+1$ , and let  $\hat{v}_h$  be a finite element interpolant satisfying (30) for  $m=0$ . Due to the best approximation property of the  $\tau$ -projection  $\Pi_\tau$  ( $\tau = \tau_1$  or  $\tau_2$ ) with respect to the norm  $\|\cdot\|_\tau$ , we have that

$$\|v - \Pi_\tau(v)\|_\tau \leq \|v - \hat{v}_h\|_\tau \leq C \sum_K \tau_K^{1/2} h_K^r \|v\|_{H^r(K)}, \quad (46)$$

where we have used (31). The result follows now from this, the boundedness of the derivatives of  $\mathbf{a}$  and the bounds (27)–(28) assumed for the constants  $c_i$ , which imply that  $\tau_{1,K}$  behaves as  $h_K^2 \tau_{2,K}^{-1}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.** There is a possible way to formulate the present method in a manner that it can be viewed as *consistent*. Indeed, if we introduce

$$\begin{aligned} B_I^*([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h, \xi_h, \delta_h], [\mathbf{v}_h, q_h, \eta_h, \gamma_h]) \\ := B([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\mathbf{v}_h, q_h]) + (\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h + \nabla p_h - \xi_h, \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_h + \nabla q_h - \eta_h)_{\tau_1} + (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_h - \delta_h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h - \gamma_h)_{\tau_2}, \end{aligned}$$

the discrete problem is equivalent to find  $[\mathbf{u}_h, p_h, \boldsymbol{\xi}_h, \delta_h] \in \mathcal{V}_{h,0} \times \mathcal{Q}_{h,0} \times \mathcal{V}_h \times \mathcal{Q}_h$  such that  $B_I^*([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h, \boldsymbol{\xi}_h, \delta_h], [\mathbf{v}_h, q_h, \boldsymbol{\eta}_h, \gamma_h]) = \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle$  for all  $[\mathbf{v}_h, q_h, \boldsymbol{\eta}_h, \gamma_h] \in \mathcal{V}_{h,0} \times \mathcal{Q}_{h,0} \times \mathcal{V}_h \times \mathcal{Q}_h$ . This problem is consistent in the sense that smooth enough solutions  $[\mathbf{u}, p]$  of the continuous problem satisfy the discrete variational equation,  $B_I^*([\mathbf{u}, p, \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla p, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}], [\mathbf{v}_h, q_h, \boldsymbol{\eta}_h, \gamma_h]) = \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle$ .

**Remark 4.** Apart from the fact that the use of the weighted  $L^2$  inner product defined by (13) and its associated projection arises naturally from the condition that the subscales be orthogonal to the finite element space, it turns out to be essential to establish the best approximation property used in (46).

The final result we need prior to proving convergence is:

**Lemma 4** (Estimates of the interpolation error of method I). Let  $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}, p]$  be the solution of the continuous problem and  $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_h = [\hat{\mathbf{u}}_h, \hat{p}_h]$  a finite element interpolant of  $\mathbf{U}$  satisfying (30), and assume that H1, H5 and H6 hold. Then

$$B_I(\mathbf{U} - \hat{\mathbf{U}}_h, \mathbf{V}_h) \leq C\varepsilon(h) \|\mathbf{V}_h\|_I, \quad \forall \mathbf{V}_h \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}, \quad (47)$$

$$\|\mathbf{U} - \hat{\mathbf{U}}_h\|_I \leq C\varepsilon(h). \quad (48)$$

**Proof.** Let  $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_u := \mathbf{u} - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_h$  and  $\hat{e}_p := p - \hat{p}_h$  be the finite element interpolation errors for the velocity and the pressure, respectively. From the definition (20) of  $B_I$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} B_I(\mathbf{U} - \hat{\mathbf{U}}_h, \mathbf{V}_h) &= \nu(\nabla \hat{\mathbf{e}}_u, \nabla \mathbf{v}_h) + (\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \hat{\mathbf{e}}_u, \mathbf{v}_h) - (\hat{e}_p, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h) + (q_h, \nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{e}}_u) \\ &\quad + (\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \hat{\mathbf{e}}_u + \nabla \hat{e}_p), \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_h + \nabla q_h)_{\tau_1} + (\Pi_{\tau_2}^\perp(\nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{e}}_u), \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h)_{\tau_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us check that each of these terms satisfies estimate (47). For the first we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\nabla \hat{\mathbf{e}}_u, \nabla \mathbf{v}_h) &\leq C\nu^{1/2} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_h\| \sum_K \frac{\nu^{1/2}}{h_K} h_K^{k+1} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{k+1,K} \\ &\leq C \|\mathbf{V}_h\|_I \sum_K \tau_{1,K}^{-1/2} h_K^{k+1} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{k+1,K}. \end{aligned}$$

Adding up the second and the fourth terms and integrating by parts we get

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \hat{\mathbf{e}}_u, \mathbf{v}_h) + (q_h, \nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{e}}_u) &= -(\hat{\mathbf{e}}_u, \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_h + \nabla q_h) \\ &\leq C \sum_K \tau_{1,K}^{1/2} \|\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_h + \nabla q_h\|_K \tau_{1,K}^{-1/2} \|\hat{\mathbf{e}}_u\|_K \\ &\leq C \|\mathbf{V}_h\|_I \sum_K \tau_{1,K}^{-1/2} h_K^{k+1} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{k+1,K}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that H6 implies that  $\mathbf{u}$  is continuous ( $d = 2, 3$ ) and  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_h$  can be taken as the standard nodal interpolant. Thus,  $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_u$  vanishes on  $\partial\Omega$ . The third term can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} -(\hat{e}_p, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h) &\leq C \sum_K \tau_{2,K}^{1/2} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h\|_K \tau_{2,K}^{-1/2} \|\hat{e}_p\|_K \\ &\leq C \|\mathbf{V}_h\|_I \sum_K \tau_{2,K}^{-1/2} h_K^k \|p\|_{k,K}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that the norm of projection operators is  $\leq 1$  we obtain the following bound for the fifth term

$$\begin{aligned} (\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \hat{\mathbf{e}}_u + \nabla \hat{e}_p), \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_h + \nabla q_h)_{\tau_1} &\leq C \|\mathbf{V}_h\|_I \sum_K \tau_{1,K}^{1/2} \left( \frac{|\mathbf{a}|_{\infty,K}}{h_K} h_K^{k+1} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{k+1,K} + \frac{1}{h_K} h_K^k \|p\|_{k,K} \right) \\ &\leq C \|\mathbf{V}_h\|_I \sum_K (\tau_{1,K}^{-1/2} h_K^{k+1} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{k+1,K} + \tau_{2,K}^{-1/2} h_K^k \|p\|_{k,K}). \end{aligned}$$

Likewise

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Pi_{\tau_2}^\perp(\nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{e}}_u), \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h)_{\tau_2} &\leq C \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h\|_{\tau_2} \sum_K \frac{\tau_{2,K}^{1/2}}{h_K} h_K^{k+1} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{k+1,K} \\
&\leq C \|\mathbf{V}_h\|_I \sum_K \tau_{1,K}^{-1/2} h_K^{k+1} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{k+1,K},
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (47). Estimate (48) can be proved in a similar manner.  $\square$

Now we are ready to prove the convergence result:

**Theorem 2** (Convergence of method I). *Under assumptions H1–H6, for  $h$  small enough there is a constant  $C$  (independent of  $\mathbf{U}$ ) such that*

$$\|\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{U}_h\|_I \leq C\varepsilon(h).$$

**Proof.** The proof is standard: from Theorem 1 and using Lemmas 3 and 4 (estimate (47)), there exists  $\mathbf{V}_h \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_I \|\hat{\mathbf{U}}_h - \mathbf{U}_h\|_I \|\mathbf{V}_h\|_I &\leq B_I(\hat{\mathbf{U}}_h - \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}_h) + B_I(\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{U}_h, \mathbf{V}_h) \\
&\leq C\varepsilon(h) \|\mathbf{V}_h\|_I,
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore  $\|\hat{\mathbf{U}}_h - \mathbf{U}_h\|_I \leq C\varepsilon(h)$ . The result follows now from Lemma 4 (estimate (48)) and the triangle inequality.  $\square$

### 3.3. Method II

Now the problem is: find  $\mathbf{U}_h \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}$  such that  $B_{II}(\mathbf{U}_h, \mathbf{V}_h) = \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle$  for all  $\mathbf{V}_h \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}$ , with  $B_{II}$  defined in (21). The norm in which we will prove stability and convergence is now

$$\|\mathbf{V}_h\|_{II} \equiv \|[\mathbf{v}_h, q_h]\|_{II} := \|[\mathbf{v}_h, q_h]\|_I + \|\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_h)\|_{\tau_1} + \|\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\nabla q_h)\|_{\tau_1}. \quad (49)$$

It is observed that this norm is slightly finer than  $\|\cdot\|_I$ . Now we will have control over the orthogonal component of both the convective derivative of the velocity and the pressure gradient. However, we still do not have control over all the components of these two vectors separately (see the following subsection).

**Theorem 3** (Stability of method II). *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 1, there is a constant  $\beta_{II} > 0$  such that*

$$\inf_{\mathbf{U}_h \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}} \sup_{\mathbf{V}_h \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}} \frac{B_{II}(\mathbf{U}_h, \mathbf{V}_h)}{\|\mathbf{U}_h\|_{II} \|\mathbf{V}_h\|_{II}} \geq \beta_{II}.$$

**Proof.** Let us proceed exactly as in the proof of Theorem 1. Using the inequality  $a^2 + b^2 \geq (a^2 + b^2)/3 + (a + b)^2/3$ , it is found that instead of (39) we now have

$$B_{II}([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\mathbf{u}_h, p_h]) \geq \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|^2 + \frac{1}{3} \|\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\boldsymbol{\xi}_h)\|_{\tau_1}^2 + \|\Pi_{\tau_2}^\perp(\delta_h)\|_{\tau_2}^2 + \frac{1}{3} \|\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h)\|_{\tau_1}^2 + \frac{1}{3} \|\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\nabla p_h)\|_{\tau_1}^2.$$

Once again, the bilinear form  $B_{II}$  is not coercive in the norm (49). If now we take  $[\mathbf{v}_h, q_h] = [\tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_h), \tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)]$ , an expression similar to (40) is found. Only the sixth and seventh terms of the RHS of this inequality are different. They and their bounds in (41) have to be replaced by

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla [\tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_h)], \Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h))_{\tau_1} + (\nabla [\tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)], \Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\nabla p_h))_{\tau_1} \\
&\geq - \sum_K \frac{C_{\text{inv}}}{h_K} \|\mathbf{a}\|_{\infty,K} \|\tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_h)\|_K \|\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h)\|_K \\
&\quad - \sum_K \frac{C_{\text{inv}}}{h_K} \|\tau_{1,K}\| \|\tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)\|_K \|\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\nabla p_h)\|_K.
\end{aligned}$$

Calling again  $\mathbf{v}_h^0 \equiv \mathbf{u}_h + \tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_h)$ ,  $\mathbf{q}_h^0 \equiv q_h + \tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)$ , it is found now that

$$\begin{aligned} B_I([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\mathbf{v}_h^0, q_h^0]) &\geq \left[1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}[1 + \psi(h)]\right] \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|^2 + \left[1 - \frac{3}{2\alpha}[1 + \psi(h)] - \frac{1}{2}\psi(h)\right] \|\Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_h)\|_{\tau_1}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{3} \|\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\boldsymbol{\xi}_h)\|_{\tau_1}^2 - \frac{1}{2}\psi(h) \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_h\|_{\tau_1}^2 + \left[\frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{2\alpha}[1 + \psi(h)]\right] \|\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h)\|_{\tau_1}^2 \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{2\alpha}[1 + \psi(h)]\right] \|\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\nabla p_h)\|_{\tau_1}^2 + \left[1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}[1 + \psi(h)] - \frac{1}{2}\psi(h)\right] \|\Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)\|_{\tau_2}^2 \\ &\quad + \left[1 - \frac{1}{2\alpha}[1 + \psi(h)]\right] \|\Pi_{\tau_2}^\perp(\delta_h)\|_{\tau_1}^2 - \frac{1}{2}\psi(h) \|\delta_h\|_{\tau_2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

From this and (35) it follows that for  $h$  small enough there is an  $\alpha > 1$  for which

$$B_{II}([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\mathbf{v}_h^0, q_h^0]) \geq C \|[\mathbf{u}_h, p_h]\|_{II}^2.$$

Similar bounds to those employed in Theorem 1 yield

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\tau_1 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_1,0}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_h), \tau_2 \diamond \Pi_{\tau_2,0}(\delta_h)]\|_{II}^2 &\leq C (\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_h\|_{\tau_1}^2 + \|\delta_h\|_{\tau_2}^2) \\ &\leq C \|[\mathbf{u}_h, p_h]\|_{II}^2, \end{aligned}$$

and the proof concludes as in Theorem 1.  $\square$

The consistency error of method II is

$$B_{II}(\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{U}_h, \mathbf{V}_h) = (\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}), \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_h)_{\tau_1} + (\Pi_{\tau_1}^\perp(\nabla p), \nabla q_h)_{\tau_1} + (\Pi_{\tau_2}^\perp(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}), \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h)_{\tau_2}.$$

The bound (45) of Lemma 3 also holds for this case, as well as the estimates for the interpolation error given in (47) and (48). The proof of all these facts follows the same lines as for method I, only with minor modifications. We give directly the convergence result, whose proof is also straightforward:

**Theorem 4** (Convergence of method II). *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 2, there is a constant  $C$  (independent of  $\mathbf{U}$ ) such that*

$$\|\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{U}_h\|_{II} \leq C\varepsilon(h),$$

where  $\varepsilon(h)$  is the same error function as for method I, given by (36).

### 3.4. Viscous dominated case

Both in methods I and II the stability result obtained shows that  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h + \nabla p_h$  is under control. However, we do not have explicit bounds over these two terms (and their errors) separately. Nevertheless, there is the possibility of bounding the pressure gradient making use of the control over the viscous term, since

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{1,K} \|\nabla p_h\|_K^2 &\leq \tau_{1,K} \|\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h + \nabla p_h\|_K^2 + \tau_{1,K} \|\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|_K^2 \\ &\leq \tau_{1,K} \|\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h + \nabla p_h\|_K^2 + C \left( \frac{|\mathbf{a}|_{\infty,K} h_K}{\nu} \right) \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|_K^2. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Let us introduce the dimensionless quantities

$$Re := \frac{|\mathbf{a}|_{\infty} L}{\nu}, \quad Re_K := \frac{|\mathbf{a}|_{\infty,K} h_K}{\nu}, \quad Re_h := \max\{Re_K \mid K \in \mathcal{P}_h\},$$

where  $L$  is a characteristic length of  $\Omega$ . These numbers may be called the *global*, *cell* and *mesh Reynolds numbers*, respectively.

From (50) it is seen that we have control over  $\tau_{1,K} \|\nabla p_h\|_K^2$ , but with a constant depending on the inverse of  $Re_K$ . Therefore, this estimate is numerically meaningful only for small values of  $Re_K$ . However, if we allow our stability

and error estimates to depend on this parameter, it is not necessary to use neither method I nor method II, but rather a simplified form of these which does not include the stabilizing term for the velocity streamline derivative. This method consists of finding  $\mathbf{U}_h \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}$  such that  $B_v(\mathbf{U}_h, \mathbf{V}_h) = \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle$  for all  $\mathbf{V}_h \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}$ , with  $B_v$  defined as

$$B_v(\mathbf{U}_h, \mathbf{V}_h) = B(\mathbf{U}_h, \mathbf{V}_h) + (\Pi_\tau^\perp(\nabla p_h), \nabla q_h)_\tau, \quad (51)$$

and with  $B$  given in (4). Clearly, the only purpose of this method is to stabilize the pressure. The behavior in convective dominated situations will be similar to that of the standard Galerkin method using div-stable velocity–pressure interpolations.

Except for the presence of the convective term in  $B$ , this formulation is the same as that introduced in [18]. We will present here a different stability proof which furthermore will show the dependence of the stability and error estimates on  $Re_h$  and  $Re$ . For that, let us introduce the norm

$$\|\mathbf{V}_h\|_v \equiv \|[\mathbf{v}_h, q_h]\|_v := v^{1/2} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_h\| + \frac{1}{1 + Re_h} \|\nabla q_h\|_\tau + \frac{1}{1 + Re} \frac{1}{v^{1/2}} \|q_h\|, \quad (52)$$

in which the analysis of the method will be performed. Now the parameters  $\tau_K$ , which correspond to  $\tau_{1,K}$  of the previous methods, can be taken as

$$\tau_K = \frac{h_{K,\min}^2}{\alpha^2 C_{\text{inv}}^2 v}, \quad (53)$$

and  $\tau_{2,K}$  simply set to zero.

**Theorem 5** (Stability of the viscous dominated case). *Assume that H3 and H4 hold, and the parameters  $\tau_K$  are given by (53). Then, for  $h$  sufficiently small there is a constant  $\beta_v > 0$  such that*

$$\inf_{\mathbf{U}_h \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}} \sup_{\mathbf{V}_h \in \mathcal{W}_{h,0}} \frac{B_v(\mathbf{U}_h, \mathbf{V}_h)}{\|\mathbf{U}_h\|_v \|\mathbf{V}_h\|_v} \geq \beta_v. \quad (54)$$

**Proof.** The proof of this result is similar to the proofs of Theorems 1 and 3, except for the presence of the  $L^2$  norm of  $q_h$  in the definition (52). Now we have that

$$B_v([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\mathbf{u}_h, p_h]) = v \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|^2 + \|\Pi_\tau^\perp(\nabla p_h)\|_\tau^2, \quad (55)$$

and, using the same strategy as in Theorem 1,

$$\begin{aligned} & B_v([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\tau \diamond \Pi_{\tau,0}(\nabla p_h), 0]) \\ &= v(\nabla \mathbf{u}_h, \nabla [\tau \diamond \Pi_{\tau,0}(\nabla p_h)]) + (\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h, \tau \diamond \Pi_{\tau,0}(\nabla p_h)) \\ & \quad + (\nabla p_h, \tau \diamond \Pi_{\tau,0}(\nabla p_h)) + (\nabla p_h, \tau \diamond \Pi_{\tau,0}(\nabla p_h) - \tau \diamond \Pi_{\tau,0}(\nabla p_h)) \\ & \geq - \sum_K v \frac{C_{\text{inv}}}{h_K} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|_K \|\tau \diamond \Pi_{\tau,0}(\nabla p_h)\|_K - \sum_K |\mathbf{a}|_{\infty,K} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|_K \|\tau \diamond \Pi_{\tau,0}(\nabla p_h)\|_K \\ & \quad + \|\Pi_{\tau,0}(\nabla p_h)\|_\tau^2 - \sum_K \|\nabla p_h\|_K \|\tau \diamond \Pi_{\tau,0}(\nabla p_h) - \tau \diamond \Pi_{\tau,0}(\nabla p_h)\|_K. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that  $\tau_K |\mathbf{a}|_{\infty,K}^2 \leq C v Re_h^2$  and using Lemma 2, it is not difficult to see that this last inequality can be written as

$$B_v([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\tau \diamond \Pi_{\tau,0}(\nabla p_h), 0]) \geq C_1 \|\Pi_{\tau,0}(\nabla p_h)\|_\tau^2 - C_2 \psi(h) \|\nabla p_h\|_\tau^2 - C_3 (1 + Re_h^2) v \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|^2, \quad (56)$$

where the constants  $C_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , do not depend neither on  $Re_h$  nor on  $Re$ . To introduce the  $L^2$  norm of  $p_h$ , let us invoke the inf–sup condition for the continuous problem, namely, the continuous counterpart of condition (7). Since  $p_h$  belongs to  $L^2(\Omega)$ , there exists a function  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}_0$  such that

$$\beta \|p_h\| \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\| \leq |(p_h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})|.$$

We have used the  $L^2$  norm of  $\nabla \mathbf{v}$  in the LHS since due to the Poincaré–Friedrichs inequality it is equivalent to the  $H^1$  norm of  $\mathbf{v}$ . We may thus normalize  $\mathbf{v}$  so that  $\|\nabla \mathbf{v}\| = \|p_h\|/v$ . Let now  $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_h$  be a finite element interpolant of  $\mathbf{v}$  satisfying (30). Using the fact that  $|a - b| \geq |a| - |b|$ , we have:



$$\begin{aligned}
B_v([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\hat{\mathbf{v}}_h, 0]) &= |\nu(\nabla \mathbf{u}_h, \nabla \hat{\mathbf{v}}_h) + (\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_h) - (p_h, \nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}}_h)| \\
&\geq |(p_h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})| - |(p_h, \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \hat{\mathbf{v}}_h))| - |\nu(\nabla \mathbf{u}_h, \nabla \hat{\mathbf{v}}_h)| - |(\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_h, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_h)|.
\end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

If  $C_L$  denotes the constant of the Poincaré–Friedrichs inequality and  $C_I$  the constant in the interpolation estimates (30), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{v} - \hat{\mathbf{v}}_h\|_K &\leq C_I \sum_{K' \subset S_K} h_{K'} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{K'}, \\
\|\nabla \hat{\mathbf{v}}_h\| &\leq \|\nabla \mathbf{v} - \nabla \hat{\mathbf{v}}_h\| + \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\| \leq C \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\| = C \frac{1}{\nu} \|p_h\|, \\
\|\hat{\mathbf{v}}_h\| &\leq C_L \|\nabla \hat{\mathbf{v}}_h\| \leq C_L C \frac{1}{\nu} \|p_h\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Integrating by parts the second term in (57), using these bounds and the quasi-uniformity of the patches  $S_K$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
B_v([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\hat{\mathbf{v}}_h, 0]) &\geq \beta \frac{1}{\nu} \|p_h\|^2 - \sum_K \|\nabla p_h\|_K \|\mathbf{v} - \hat{\mathbf{v}}_h\|_K - \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\| \|\nabla \hat{\mathbf{v}}_h\| - |\mathbf{a}|_\infty \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\| \|\hat{\mathbf{v}}_h\| \\
&\geq \beta \frac{1}{\nu} \|p_h\|^2 - C \sum_K h_K \|\nabla p_h\|_K \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_K - C \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\| \|p_h\| - |\mathbf{a}|_\infty C_L C \frac{1}{\nu} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\| \|p_h\|.
\end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

On the other hand, from Young's inequality we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_K h_K \|\nabla p_h\|_K \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_K &\leq \sum_K \left[ \frac{h_K^2}{2\nu\epsilon} \|\nabla p_h\|_K^2 + \frac{\nu\epsilon}{2} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_K^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\epsilon} \|\nabla p_h\|_\tau^2 + \frac{\epsilon}{2\nu} \|p_h\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

for all  $\epsilon > 0$ . Using a similar inequality for the last two terms of (58), taking  $\epsilon$  small enough and noting that since  $C_L$  is proportional to  $L$ ,  $|\mathbf{a}|_\infty C_L/\nu$  is proportional to  $Re$ , we obtain

$$B_v([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\hat{\mathbf{v}}_h, 0]) \geq C_4 \frac{1}{\nu} \|p_h\|^2 - C_5 \|\nabla p_h\|_\tau^2 - C_6 (1 + Re^2) \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|^2, \quad (59)$$

for constants  $C_4$ ,  $C_5$  and  $C_6$  independent of  $Re_h$  and  $Re$ . If now we take

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{v}_h^0 &\equiv \mathbf{u}_h + \frac{A_1}{1 + Re_h^2} \tau \diamond \Pi_{\tau,0}(\nabla p_h) + \frac{A_2}{1 + Re^2} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_h, \\
q_h^0 &\equiv p_h,
\end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

and add up (55), (56) and (59) multiplied by the corresponding coefficients, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
B_v([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\mathbf{v}_h^0, q_h^0]) &\geq [1 - C_3 A_1 - C_6 A_2] \nu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|^2 + \left[ 1 - \frac{C_2 \psi(h) A_1}{1 + Re_h^2 \beta_0} - \frac{C_5 A_2}{1 + Re^2 \beta_0} \right] \|\Pi_\tau^\perp(\nabla p_h)\|_\tau^2 \\
&\quad + \left[ \frac{C_1 A_1}{1 + Re_h^2} - \frac{C_2 \psi(h) A_1}{1 + Re_h^2 \beta_0} - \frac{C_5 A_2}{1 + Re^2 \beta_0} \right] \|\Pi_{\tau,0}(\nabla p_h)\|_\tau^2 + \left[ \frac{C_4}{\nu} \frac{A_2}{1 + Re^2} \right] \|p_h\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

where we have made use of the stability condition (35) (now with  $\mathbf{z}_h = \nabla p_h$ ). From this, it follows that there are values of the constants  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  for which

$$B_v([\mathbf{u}_h, p_h], [\mathbf{v}_h^0, q_h^0]) \geq C \|\llbracket [\mathbf{u}_h, p_h] \rrbracket_v\|^2.$$

The theorem now follows after checking that

$$\|\llbracket [\mathbf{v}_h^0, q_h^0] \rrbracket_v\| \leq C \|\llbracket [\mathbf{u}_h, p_h] \rrbracket_v\|,$$

which is easily verified from the definition (60) of  $[\mathbf{v}_h^0, q_h^0]$  and noting that  $(1 + x^2)^{-1} \leq 2(1 + x)^{-1}$  for all  $x > 0$ .  $\square$

The same strategy as for methods I and II can now be followed to prove convergence. We omit the intermediate steps and simply state the final result:

**Theorem 6** (Convergence of the viscous dominated case). *If assumptions H1–H5 hold and the parameters  $\tau_K$  are given by (53), for  $h$  small enough there is a constant  $C$  (independent of  $U$ ) such that*

$$\|U - U_h\|_v \leq C(1 + Re_h) \sum_K (\tau_K^{-1/2} h_K^{k+1} \|u\|_{k+1,K} + \nu^{-1/2} h_K^k \|p\|_{k,K}).$$

This convergence estimate, as well as the stability estimate (54), deteriorates as  $\nu$  decreases. Due to the dependence on  $Re_h$  and  $Re$  explicitly displayed by (52), it is seen that control over the  $L^2$  norm of the pressure is rapidly lost as  $\nu \rightarrow 0$ , since in this case  $Re \rightarrow \infty$ . However, a somewhat stronger control is obtained on  $\|\nabla q_h\|_\tau$ . We may consider that the finite element mesh is sufficiently refined so as to maintain  $Re_h$  (relatively) small. These results are similar to those obtained in [30] for the nonlinear Navier–Stokes equations, even though the method analyzed in this reference is also intended to stabilize convection.

**Remark 5.** In the absence of convection, the norm (52) in which stability and convergence has been proven is even finer than for the Galerkin method using div-stable velocity–pressure interpolations. This in particular allows to extend this pressure stabilized method to the nonlinear Navier–Stokes equations and obtain *exactly* the same results as for the Galerkin method (see [11,24]). This extension is analyzed in [19] for the stationary problem and in [3] for the transient case.

**Remark 6.** In [8] a method similar to the one presented here *for the Stokes problem* is put as example of a general stabilization procedure. It is claimed there that optimal error estimates are obtained if  $\tau_K$  is taken of order  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  instead of given by (53). However, this is possible only if pressures are at least of the *same* regularity as the velocities.

## 4. Numerical results

In this section we compare the numerical results obtained with the first stabilized formulation analyzed in this paper, given by (19), and the algebraic subgrid scale method, given by (14), in two simple bidimensional examples. We will use the acronym OSS for the former (standing for orthogonal subscale stabilization) and ASGS for the latter. The stabilization parameters used are the same in both formulations, with the constants in (11)–(12) taken as  $c_1 = 4$ ,  $c_2 = 2$ ,  $c_3 = 1$ ,  $c_4 = 1/2$ , and  $h_{K,\min}$  as the length of the element side for bilinear elements and half of it for biquadratic elements, the two interpolation types considered.

### 4.1. Flow in an L-shaped domain

The purpose of this example is to check the performance of the OSS method in a simple example but showing three features of practical interest: the presence of internal layers, of boundary layers and high pressure variations.

The computational domain is taken as the interior of  $[0, 3] \times [0, 3] \setminus [0, 2] \times [1, 3]$ . The inlet is taken at  $x = 0$ , where a discontinuous inflow velocity  $u = (1, 0)$  for  $0 \leq y \leq 1/2$  and  $u = (0, 0)$  for  $1/2 < y \leq 1$  is prescribed. A zero pressure is prescribed at the outlet  $y = 3$  and on the rest of the boundary  $u$  is fixed to  $(0, 0)$ . The Oseen equations (1)–(2) are solved, taking  $a = (1, 0)$  and  $\nu = 10^{-4}$ . For such a small viscosity, the inflow discontinuous profile propagates inwards with little smearing and a velocity boundary layer is created at  $x = 3$ . It has to be noted that since the boundary data are discontinuous the velocity components do not belong to  $H^1(\Omega)$ . Nevertheless, this test is intended not to check convergence, but as an example of a problem with internal layers.

The domain is discretized using 2000 biquadratic elements of equal size, yielding 8241 nodal points. For these elements, second-order derivatives cannot be neglected in the ASGS method (14).

Pressure contours and velocity vectors are shown in Fig. 1. These results have been obtained using the ASGS method, and are very similar to those obtained using the OSS formulation. The differences are observed in Fig. 2. Three main conclusions can be drawn from these. First, internal layers are approximated similarly, with the same overshoots and undershoots in both methods. This could be expected, since both the ASGS and OSS introduce stream-line diffusion, but no crosswind numerical dissipation. From the  $y$ -velocity section at  $y = 2$  it is seen that the OSS




Fig. 1. Pressure contours (left) and velocity vectors (right) for the flow in an L-shaped domain.




Fig. 2.  $x$ -velocity at  $x = 1$  (left),  $y$ -velocity at  $y = 2$  (middle) and pressure at  $x = 3$  (right) for the flow in an L-shaped domain.

yields more oscillations near the boundary layer, which are due to the fact that it introduces less numerical diffusion. This is also the reason why the pressure variation is much better captured using OSS than ASGS, as it is seen from the pressure section at the wall  $x = 3$ . A similar behavior was found in the numerical examples presented in [15] for advection–diffusion and Stokes problems.

Referring to the cost of the calculation, it obviously depends on the particular implementation adopted. We have used as iterative solver the GMRES method only with diagonal scaling, with a Krylov dimension of 25 and a residual tolerance of  $10^{-8}$ . Giving the reference 100 time units (t.u.) to the solution of the linear system for the ASGS method, the solution of the linear system for OSS has been 97.2 t.u., in spite of the fact that Jacobi iterations have been needed to deal with  $M^{-1}$ , as explained in Section 2.3. This reduction is due to the fact that 142 iterations have been required for ASGS and only 129 for OSS. The construction of the system matrix has taken 53.7 t.u. for OSS and 58.5 t.u. for ASGS.

#### 4.2. Convergence test

The purpose of this test is to show that when the solution is smooth, the OSS method has an optimal convergence rate, similar to that of the ASGS formulation.

We take  $\Omega$  as the unit square and the force term so that the exact solution is  $p = 0$  and  $\mathbf{u}(x, y) = (f(x)g'(y), -f'(x)g(y))$ , with  $f(x) = x^2(1-x)^2$  and  $g(y) = y^2(1-y)^2$ . This velocity field vanishes on  $\partial\Omega$ . The viscosity has been taken  $\nu = 0.001$  and the advection velocity  $\mathbf{a} = (2, 3)$ . We have used meshes with different element sizes  $h$ , which once normalized range from 0.1 to 0.025.

In Fig. 3 we have plotted the convergence of the velocities obtained with the OSS and the ASGS methods as the mesh is refined in the discrete  $\ell^2$  norm and for both the  $Q_1$  (bilinear) and  $Q_2$  (biquadratic) interpolations (with the same set of nodes in both cases). This error is defined as




Fig. 3. Discrete  $\ell^2$  errors for Example 3 using  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  elements.

$$E = \left[ \sum_{a=1}^{n_{\text{pts}}} \sum_{i=1}^2 (U_i^a - u_i(\mathbf{x}_a))^2 \right]^{1/2} \left[ \sum_{a=1}^{n_{\text{pts}}} \sum_{i=1}^2 (u_i(\mathbf{x}_a))^2 \right]^{-1/2},$$

where  $n_{\text{pts}}$  is the total number of nodal points,  $U_i^a$  is the  $i$ th component of the nodal velocity at node  $a$  and  $\mathbf{x}_a$  are the coordinates of this node.

The optimal convergence rate that should be expected is 2 for  $Q_1$  elements and 3 for the  $Q_2$  case. From Fig. 3 it is seen that this is approximately what has been found. In both cases the convergence rate is slightly higher for the OSS method. These results are very similar to those obtained in [15] with the same test for the nonlinear Navier–Stokes equations.

## 5. Concluding remarks

Three different stabilized finite element formulations for the Oseen problem have been presented in this paper. Their main features are:

- (1) The original method (referred to as method I in the paper) is directly based on the subgrid scale concept, assuming that the subscales are orthogonal to the finite element space. After some simple approximations, a stabilized formulation is obtained with two major benefits with respect to the original Galerkin method: it allows the use of equal velocity–pressure interpolations and it provides optimal control on the streamline derivative of the velocity field.
- (2) The second method (method II) is somewhat simpler, since it introduces less coupling in the discrete velocity–pressure equations (although one more projection needs to be performed). Furthermore, stability and error estimates have been shown to hold in a norm finer than for method I, since now it is possible to control the orthogonal components of the convective term and the pressure gradient.
- (3) If only the pressure interpolation is to be stabilized, a simplification of methods I and II has been proposed and analyzed. The norm in which stability and convergence have been proven depends explicitly on the mesh Reynolds number and the global Reynolds number.

Finally, the numerical experiments presented show that the OSS formulation is very accurate and introduces less numerical dissipation than the more usual ASGS method. This implies that it allows stronger localized oscillations near boundaries, but also that it leads to a sharper resolution of strong variations of the unknowns. This fact has as a

consequence a better treatment of the pressure near boundaries. See [15,18] for further discussion about this point and some additional numerical results.

## References

- [1] M. Ainsworth, J.T. Oden, *A Posteriori Error Estimation in Finite Element Analysis*, Wiley–Interscience, New York, 2000.
- [2] R. Becker, M. Braack, A finite element pressure gradient stabilization for the Stokes equations based on local projections, *Calcolo* 38 (2001) 173–199.
- [3] J. Blasco, R. Codina, Space and time error estimates for a first order, pressure stabilized finite element method for the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations, *Applied Numerical Mathematics* 38 (2001) 475–497.
- [4] P. Bochev, Z. Cai, T.A. Manteuffel, S.F. McCormick, Analysis of velocity–flux first-order system least-squares principles for the Navier–Stokes equations: Part I, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 35 (1998) 990–1009.
- [5] S.C. Brenner, L.R. Scott, *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*, Springer, Berlin, 1994.
- [6] F. Brezzi, J. Douglas, Stabilized mixed methods for the Stokes problem, *Numerische Mathematik* 53 (1988) 225–235.
- [7] F. Brezzi, M. Fortin, *Mixed and Hybrid Finite Element Methods*, Springer, Berlin, 1991.
- [8] F. Brezzi, M. Fortin, A minimal stabilisation procedure for mixed finite element methods, *Numerische Mathematik* 89 (2001) 457–491.
- [9] F. Brezzi, L.P. Franca, T.J.R. Hughes, A. Russo,  $b = \int g$ , *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 145 (1997) 329–339.
- [10] F. Brezzi, J. Pitkäranta, On the stabilization of finite element approximation of the Stokes problem, in: W. Hackbusch (Ed.), *Efficient Solution of Elliptic Systems*, Vieweg, Braunschweig, 1984, pp. 11–19.
- [11] F. Brezzi, J. Rappaz, P.A. Raviart, Finite dimensional approximation of nonlinear problems. Part I: Branches of non-singular solutions, *Numerische Mathematik* 36 (1981) 1–25.
- [12] A.N. Brooks, T.J.R. Hughes, Streamline upwind/Petrov–Galerkin formulations for convection dominated flows with particular emphasis on the incompressible Navier–Stokes equation, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 32 (1982) 199–259.
- [13] E. Burman, P. Hansbo, Edge stabilization for Galerkin approximations of convection–diffusion–reaction problems, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 193 (2004) 1437–1453.
- [14] T. Chacón, A term by term stabilization algorithm for the finite element solution of incompressible flow problems, *Numerische Mathematik* 79 (1998) 283–319.
- [15] R. Codina, Stabilization of incompressibility and convection through orthogonal sub-scales in finite element methods, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 190 (2000) 1579–1599.
- [16] R. Codina, A stabilized finite element method for generalized stationary incompressible flows, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 190 (2001) 2681–2706.
- [17] R. Codina, Stabilized finite element approximation of transient incompressible flows using orthogonal subscales, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 191 (2002) 4295–4321.
- [18] R. Codina, J. Blasco, A finite element formulation for the Stokes problem allowing equal velocity–pressure interpolation, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 143 (1997) 373–391.
- [19] R. Codina, J. Blasco, Analysis of a pressure-stabilized finite element approximation of the stationary Navier–Stokes equations, *Numerische Mathematik* 87 (2000) 59–81.
- [20] J. Douglas, J. Wang, An absolutely stabilized finite element method for the Stokes problem, *Mathematics of Computation* 52 (1989) 495–508.
- [21] L. Franca, T.J.R. Hughes, A.F.D. Loula, I. Miranda, A new family of stable elements for nearly incompressible elasticity based on a mixed Petrov–Galerkin finite element formulation, *Numerische Mathematik* 53 (1988) 123–141.
- [22] L. Franca, R. Stenberg, Error analysis of some Galerkin least-squares methods for the elasticity equations, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 28 (1991) 1680–1697.
- [23] L.P. Franca, S.L. Frey, Stabilized finite element methods: II. The incompressible Navier–Stokes equations, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 99 (1992) 209–233.
- [24] V. Girault, P.A. Raviart, *Finite Element Methods for Navier–Stokes Equations*, Springer, Berlin, 1986.
- [25] P.M. Gresho, On the theory of semi-implicit projection methods for viscous incompressible flow and its implementation via a finite element method that also introduces a nearly consistent mass matrix. Part I: Theory, *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids* 11 (1990) 587–620.
- [26] T.J.R. Hughes, Multiscale phenomena: Green’s function, the Dirichlet-to-Neumann formulation, subgrid scale models, bubbles and the origins of stabilized formulations, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 127 (1995) 387–401.
- [27] T.J.R. Hughes, G.R. Feijóo, L. Mazzei, J.B. Quincy, The variational multiscale method—a paradigm for computational mechanics, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 166 (1998) 3–24.
- [28] T.J.R. Hughes, L.P. Franca, M. Balestra, A new finite element formulation for computational fluid dynamics: V. Circumventing the Babuška–Brezzi condition: a stable Petrov–Galerkin formulation for the Stokes problem accommodating equal-order interpolations, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 59 (1986) 85–99.
- [29] L. Tobiska, G. Lube, A modified streamline-diffusion method for solving the stationary Navier–Stokes equations, *Numerische Mathematik* 59 (1991) 13–29.
- [30] L. Tobiska, R. Verfürth, Analysis of a streamline diffusion finite element method for the Stokes and Navier–Stokes equations, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 33 (1996) 107–127.